



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE TEXT OF THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE SONG OF SONGS

BY DR. JOSHUA BLOCH
New York University

The fact that no ancient document handed down in manuscript is perfectly free from error has long been known, and that the Bible forms no exception to the rule is now generally admitted. It naturally follows that the Bible no less than other ancient documents is the object of textual criticism. The Old Testament, however, enjoys a peculiarity of its own—a peculiarity which lies in the fact that the material for textual criticism is furnished by the ancient versions rather than ancient manuscripts. The ancient versions are of great weight as documents by the aid of which modern scholarship is enabled to reconstruct the original text of the Bible where the transmitted text is faulty, or to defend it where it is sound. In the words of Geiger, "Auffassung und Feststellung des Bibeltextes muss sich am Schärfsten in den *Uebersetzungen* der verschiedenen Zeiten ausprägen."¹

The object of the present study is to examine a part of one of these versions and determine the nature and value of its testimony. The version is the Syriac translation of the Old Testament commonly called the Peshitta.² It is indeed remarkable that to none of the ancient versions of the Bible has been paid as little attention as to the Syriac, which, owing to its great antiquity, is one of the most valuable documents in ascertaining the original text of the Bible. In fact, in point of age, the Peshitta takes precedence of every other oriental version; and such has been the high esteem in which it has been held by men of great eminence. There are problems presented by the Peshitta that still remain partly unsolved; particularly those

¹ *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, etc., p. 160.

² Peshitta is the pronunciation according to the "Nestorian" system, which preserves the older sounds of the vowels, as in *Talitha* and *Maranatha*. The Monophysites and Maronites say *Pëshittô*. The word is a feminine adjective in the "definite" state, agreeing with *mappakâ*, i.e., "edition," but Bar Hebraeus sometimes used it by itself in the "absolute" feminine, hence the spelling *Peshito*. The form *Peschito* is merely an adaptation to German orthography.

dealing with the question of the origin and authorship of that work. Almost at the outset of the study of the Peshitta one finds himself confronted by difficulties which can only be met by a study of the general purpose and character of that work, the limitations by which the translators were beset, and the principles which guided them in the performance of their task. The student of the Peshitta must begin by placing before his mind the conditions under which it was produced, and the relation of the original work to our present texts, Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac.

Strictly speaking, the Peshitta is not a single version,¹ but a series of versions produced at various times and by translators whose ideals were not altogether alike. Internal evidence of this fact may be found in the varying standards of excellence which appear in different books or groups of books.² The student must also endeavor to realize the condition of the Hebrew text which lay before the translators of the Peshitta. Although the text of the Hebrew Bible has undergone no material changes since the beginning of the second century C.E., the Peshitta nevertheless presents a version of an earlier text which often differed materially from the text of the printed Hebrew Bible and of all existing Hebrew manuscripts. All scholars who have perused the Peshitta of the Old Testament have arrived at the conclusion that it is a direct translation from the Hebrew, though not always corresponding exactly with the Masoretic text of our day. What text the translators may have used we can only conjecture. It differs here and there from our own, though the more important deviations are comparatively few. While one can safely assume that the Peshitta was executed entirely from the Hebrew, one must not overlook the fact that it underwent later revision which brought it more into conformity with the LXX—this to a greater degree in some books than in others.³ Whatever the case be, the Peshitta as a translation from the Hebrew, and

¹ Heller, *Untersuchungen über die Peschitta*, etc., p. 37, claims that the Peshitta is the work of one author, though he admits the possibility of another author being responsible for Chronicles, because it consistently avoids anthropomorphic expressions. Cf. also Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 264.

² See my article "The Authorship of the Peshitta" in *AJSL*, XXXV (July, 1919), pp. 215-22.

³ See my article on "The Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta," *AJSL*, XXXVI (January, 1920), pp. 161-66.

evidently executed by able hands, may be regarded as a valuable instrument in ascertaining the state of the original text of the Old Testament at a very early period.¹

The critical and exegetical value of the Peshitta is now almost universally recognized. The study of its text, therefore, deserves the attention of scholars. Indeed, as early as 1832 Roediger² pointed out the need of an analytical examination of the text of the Peshitta, as preparatory to an exhaustive treatment of the various problems it presents. Four decades later Baethgen³ stated explicitly that

der einzige Weg, um zu einem selbständigen Urteil und zu wenn auch nur relativer Klarheit zu kommen, ist demnach der, die einzelnen Bücher genau auf ihre Anlage, ihr Verhältnis zu unserm hebräischen Text und den übrigen alten Uebersetzungen, sowie auf etwaige Eigentümlichkeiten in der Manier des Uebertragens zu untersuchen und aus diesen Einzeluntersuchungen ein Gesamtergebn zu ziehen.

This task was subsequently undertaken by various students who have produced a series of studies dealing with the text of a large number of the books⁴ of the Syriac Bible—all with but a few exceptions are inadequately done.

In the following pages it is proposed to present a study of the Syriac text of the Song of Songs in the light of the Masoretic text and the ancient primary versions of the Bible. The textual notes resolve themselves to a storehouse of observations concerning the

¹ The favorable judgment which the Peshitta received at the hands of modern scholars was evidently not shared by the ancient students of the Bible. We find that for various reasons the use of the LXX or the Syro-Hexaplaric version was preferred by such Syrians as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Bar Hebraeus. Cf. Theodorus Mopsuest., in Mai, *Nov. Patrum biblioth.*, VII, 271 on Hab. 2:11: τινὲς δὲ ἔφασαν τὸν σῦρον πᾶσαλον λέγειν· ἀλλ' ἀνόητον εἶναι ἀφέντας τὴν βραβλοὺς τὴν φωνήν καθ' ἣν ὁ προφήτης ἐφέγγεζτο . . . σύμφυρ προσέχοντες μεταβεβληγκότει τὴν βραβλων εἰς τὴν σῦρον, εἰτα πολλὰκις τὸ παῖσιμα τοῦ οὐκείου νόμου συνωλήθητι δεινάται φωτὶς ὅς δοκεῖ μοι καὶ σὺν εἰς τι ποτέ λέγει τὸν κἀνδαρὸν πάνην γε εἰλωθῶτα ἐμφωλεύειν τοῖς τοίχοις τὸ πᾶσσαλος τεθεύκεναι, ἵνα δοκῇ τινα τὸ λεγομένον ἀκολουθαίν. *Ibid.*, p. 253 on Zeph. 3:2: περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ μή τοῖς ἐδομηκόunta ἐσφάλλαι τὸν δὲ εἰς τὴν σῦρων γλωτταν ἡρημνεύκοτα τὴν γραφὴν πολλὰ δικαιό- ῳτερον δὲ νομισθῆναι τοῦτο πεπονηθέναι, εἰρηται πρόσθεν ἡμῖν ἀρκούτως. Bar Hebraeus attacked the Peshitta on linguistic grounds; e.g., Ps. 4:5 ṣ has ܫܬܝܬܝܬ instead of ܫܬܠܘܟܝܬܝܬ.

which would be expected (cf. Wiseman, *Horae Syriacae*, p. 106). He calls it ܠܬܬܐܝܬܐ and wrote a treatise in which he endeavored to show "that the translation of LXX is more correct than the Peshitta." Cf. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.*, II, 279.

² *Hallesche Literaturzeitung*, 1832, 4, and in his article "Peschito" in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, XVIII, col. 292a ff.

³ *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschitta* (Kiel, 1878), p. 6.

⁴ See *Bibliography of the Peshitta Old Testament*.

various aspects of the Peshitta—a help for the textual criticism of the Bible. All the editions of the Syriac text of this book have been continuously consulted and the variations indicated. It goes without saying that most of the important commentaries have been utilized with admiration and gratitude.

The Syriac text of the Song of Songs has been printed six times. The *editio princeps* is that in the Paris Polyglot (1629–45) reproduced without any improvements in the London Polyglot (1659). Lee in his edition of the Peshitta (1823) reprinted it again, omitting the vowels, introducing one better reading and retaining most of the misprints of the former editions. The text of the Paris Polyglot contains a misprint (8:5) corrected in the London Polyglot, which, on the other hand, allowed three new ones to creep in (1:5; 2:8; and 8:9). Lee, in his edition, reproduced these misprints and allowed a new one to slip in (4:1) while he corrected the one in 1:5. The Urmia edition of 1852 is a reproduction of Lee's text in Nestorian characters with Nestorian vowels and with improved spellings.¹ While some of Lee's misprints are corrected, no variation from it, unless supported by other evidence, can safely be considered a variant reading. Dr. Adolf Hübsch's text, printed in 1886 in his publication *Die fünf Megilloth nebst dem syrischen Thargum genannt "Peschito,"* is a mere reprint of the text of the Polyglots in Hebrew characters and vowels. Thus, these five editions are, but for Lee's one improvement, reducible to one edition; so that the *editio princeps* practically represents the present state of the printed text.² The sixth issue published in Mosul in 1887 seems to have no independent value whatever. It differs from the Urmia edition in sixteen places, seven of which are mere orthographic differences. In these seven places the Mosul edition is perhaps better than that of Urmia. Another case involves merely a difference in punctuation; while two other readings are of no significance whatever. In the remaining six cases the readings of the Mosul text are supported by MSS, LXX, and Vulgate, which point to the probability of the editors having

¹ See Barnes, *Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles*, etc., p. xv.

² Cf. my article "The Printed Texts of the Peshitta Old Testament" in *AJSL*, XXXVII (January, 1921), pp. 136–44.

corrected the text. In all these cases, with but one exception (6:8), the Mosul edition has a very good reading. That this edition was not expressly altered to make it agree with the Vulgate can be seen from the fact that the variant in the text of the Songs of Songs 8:13 differs in its sentence arrangement from that of the Vulgate.

While ample use was made of the ancient versions, no comparison was made between the Syriac text of the Song of Songs and the Targum. Such a comparison must be excluded because of the distance in age. The Peshitta could not have been influenced by the Targum, the date of the latter surely being several centuries later, for it mentions the Mohammedans (1:7), the Mishna, and the Talmud (1:2; 5:10).¹ Besides, the Targum and the Peshitta differ entirely in their character. The Peshitta is a literal version of the Hebrew text, while the Targum is a Midrash-like commentary. Following the example of Barnes² and Baumann,³ no use was made of the Arabic version or of patristic quotations. The Arabic version promises some help, but, as was already pointed out by Barnes,⁴ "it must be edited before it can be used." Patristic quotations, on the contrary, are unpromising. Aphraates and Ephraim, moreover, can be used for the most part in an uncritical edition only. The five quotations found in Bar Hebraeus and the half-passage in Aphraates⁵ are worthless for textual criticism⁶ while the writings of Philoxenus contain no quotation from the Song of Songs. The biblical quotations in the writings of the church fathers are useful as evidence of the characteristics of the translations which they employed; but as a rule they did not aim at strict accuracy of reference so that their citations cannot always have the authority to overrule the verdict of the ancient codices.⁷ Much material, interesting both in itself and in connection with the present subject, has been simply referred to, or relegated to a footnote, because it is of a kind accessible to students.

¹ See Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden* (2d ed.), p. 68.

² Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. viii.

³ Baumann, *Die Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta zum Buche Ijob, etc.*, p. 329.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. viii.

⁵ *Dem. vi. de monachis* 19 (ed. Graffin), I, col. 309.

⁶ Cf. S. Euringer, in *Biblische Studien*, VI, p. 125.

⁷ Cf. Gwilliam, in *Studia Biblica*, III, p. 66.

CHAPTER I

¹ Fürst in his **אוצר לשון הקודש** (Leipzig, 1840) describes **הורק** as "n. pr. loci fertilis et oleo praestanti clari," an explanation already given by Ibn Esra, who, however, rejects it, explaining it as a Hophal from **רוק** = "empty."

is undoubtedly a better reading, not only because of the suffix of the second person, but also because of the singular which is likewise the reading of LXX, τὸ ταμεῖον. Compare Y. Sanh. XI, and 30c Y. Kethub. IV, 28d = "bedchamber." שְׁנֵי מַחְנֵי translates סַנְסַן, while in other places the word סַנְסַן is used for this expression.¹—For the Syriac rendering of דָּדִיךְ, cf. above, verse 2.—מִישְׁרִים אֲהַבֹּךְ being dependent on נִזְכִּירָה, & read instead וּמִן יִשְׁרִים אֲהַבֹּךְ = סַנְסַן. Hence the closing part of the verse receives the epicurean meaning of נִזְכִּירָה דָּדִיךְ מִיִּין וּמִמִּישְׁרִים אֲהַבִּיךְ; cf. Ibn Ezra *ad. loc.*

5. אֶסְכֵּן אֶן סַלֵּן אֶן שְׁחֹרָה אֲנִי וְנֹאדָה וְכֹי. Ishodadh (Diettrich, p. xix) after אֶסְכֵּן אֶן inserts the word חָכֵר. Owing to the lack of diminutives in the Syriac language in the time of &² the translator was not in a position to give an exact rendering of שְׁחֹרָה, and therefore evidently used אֶסְכֵּן = שְׁחֹרָה.³

6. שִׁשׁוּפְתָנִי: This word is used (Job 20:9; 28:7) in the sense of "a fixed gaze," in the latter passage of a bird of prey. Another proposed meaning connects the word with שָׂדֶה (Gen. 41:23) in the sense of "burned," "scorched." Aquila, συνέκαυσσε; Theodotion, περιέφυξε. The rendering of & אֶסְכֵּן = שְׁחֹרָה, which is confirmed by Vulgate *decoloravit* in the sense of "blackened," "browened," or "tanned," is accepted by many modern commentators, such as Ginsburg, Rothstein, Harper, Oettli, and others.—נָחֵר & = נָחֵר. This Syriac word is frequently met with in rabbinic literature in the sense of fighting, cf. Y. Peah IV, 18b, top, שְׁנֵים שִׁדְּיוֹ מִתְכַּתְּשִׁין, הוּרָה קָא, ד' מַלְכוּת מִתְכַּתְּשׁוֹת וְכֹי. Sifre Deut. 37, וְכֹי מִתְכַּתְּשׁוֹת. Likewise LXX, Theodotion, and Symmachus (διεμαχέσαντο. They evidently took it as a Niphal from חָרָה instead of נָחֵר.—For נָחֵר אֶת הַכְּרִמִּים & correctly uses מִנְחָה = נָחֵר. Instead of כְּרִמִּי & read כְּרִמִּי.

¹ In both places where נִזְכִּירָה occurs, Isa. 25:9 and Ps. (117) 118:24, & translates it by סַנְסַן, while the phrase נִזְכִּירָה in Prov. 23:24 & renders by סַנְסַן. See Pinkus, *ZATW*, 1894, p. 200. In Isa. 24:16 may perhaps be explained as derived from the Syriac word meaning joy.

² See Hoffmann, *The Principles of Syriac Grammar* (tr. by B. H. Cowper, London, 1858), sec. 147, p. 69; but cf. Nöldeke, *Comp. Syr. Gram.* (London, 1904), p. 80.

³ The words אֶרְמֵד, etc., in Lev. 13 receive similar treatment.

⁴ But cf. & at Isa. 41:11; 45:24 where the same word occurs.

7. אִיכָה.—עַל וְיִסְפָּח §, שְׁאֵהֲבָה.—הִגִּידוּ=יִבְדְּלוּ §, הִגִּידָה. אִיכָה; אשר למה=שלמה—ואיכה=סִמְחָה §, חֲרִבִּיץ; LXX, μή ποτε; Vulgate, *ne*. Undoubtedly an Aramaic form. § therefore יִסְפָּח¹; cf. Ezra 7:23, where דִּי־לְמָה is equivalent to דִּי־לָא in Dan. 21:13.²—For כְּעִטָּה, which is very unsuitable and gives a very poor sense, the reading of § אִמְרֵי יִסְפָּח=כְּחִיָּה, or better כְּעִטָּה (cf. Gen. 37:15; Exod. 23:4; Prov. 21:16), seems to be better and is confirmed by Symmachus *ρεμβομένη*; Vulgate, *ne vagari insipiam*.³ §, Symmachus, and the Vulgate apparently read “wanderer,” transposing the letters and making עִטָּה into טְעִיה, the participle of the verb “to wander.” See, however, §’s rendering of וְעַתָּה עִטָּה in Isa. 22:17 and the rabbinic commentaries on the passage.—עַל עִדְרִי=עִדְרִי §, על עִדְרִי; cf. §’s rendering of עִדְרִי לְבָדּוּ in Gen. 32:16.—חֲרִבִּיץ is rendered in § as יִסְפָּח=יִסְפָּח, “rams.” Accordingly §’s Hebrew text very likely read שְׁלֹמֶה אֶחָדָה כְּעִטָּה בְּעִדְרֵי אִילִּיךְ.

8. אִם לֹא חֲדָעִי לָךְ. §, following LXX, *ἐὰν μὴ γνῶς σεαυτήν*, translates it אִם לֹא חֲדָעִי לָךְ, taking לָךְ as if it were a pronoun, which is quite in agreement with Syriac usage;⁴ but here, as in many other places in the Bible (e.g., Cant. 2:10), לָךְ is not accusative but a *dativus ethicus*, see Gesenius’ *Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford, 1910, p. 381. גִּדְּיִיךְ is translated in § by גִּדְּיִיךְ=גִּדְּיִיךְ without regard as to its gender, or, as some take it, to its diminutive form.—For מִשְׁכָּנוֹת על מִשְׁכָּנוֹת § has בְּמִשְׁכָּנוֹת=מִשְׁכָּנוֹת.


9. For בְּרִכְבִּי § uses the singular מִשְׁכָּנִי. Considering the fact that the Bible frequently uses the singular רֶכֶב as a collective noun, we may safely assume that in the present case, though unique, it has nothing to do with a plural form, but is rather a survival of an early case-ending.⁶ Contrary to its practice, § translates here in the singular, for the text here obviously does not deal with a chariot but rather with the carriage of Pharaoh; cf. Ehrlich *ad loc*.

¹ See Grätz, *Schir Haschirim*, p. 43.

² See Kautzsch, *Gram. Bibl. Aram.*, 69, 10.

³ See Grätz, *loc. cit.*, p. 131; Marti, p. 4, and Targum *ad loc*.

⁴ See Brockelmann, *Syr. Gram.*, p. 39.

⁵ §^{swl}, against all other available witnesses such as §^{sum} and Bar Hebraeus, read .

⁶ See Gesenius’ *Hebrew Grammar*, p. 253.

10. *לחייך* is translated in *š* by *ܦܚܝܚܐ*, the correct Syriac word for "cheek."—For *בחוריים* *š* has *ܦܚܝܚܐ*; cf. the talmudic expression *שפחה מגדולת* in Kiddushin 49a. LXX has *ὡς τρυγόνες*, as if it were *כתרים*.—For *צוארך* *š* has *ܐܘܪܝܬܐ* = *וצוארך*.—For *בחרוזים* *š* has *ܚܘܙܝܢ*. Here, too, LXX read *בחרוזים*.

11. For *נקדות הכסף* *š* has *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*. *š* evidently did not use for *נקדות* the corresponding *ܕܡܝܢ*, but rather *ܐܚܝܬܐ* which makes good sense.

12. For *עד שהמלך* *š* seems to have read *ܐܕܡܠܟܐ*, for it has *ܚܡܪ ܡܠܟܐ*. For *במסכר* *š* has *ܡܫܚܚܐ*, LXX, Aquila *ἐν ανακλισει*. Symmachus has a similar rendering.—*נרד* is translated in *š* as a plural and without the pronominal suffix *ܢܪܕܐ*, but *š^m š^a HM^a and HM^b* have *ܢܪܕܐ* which agrees with the Hebrew.

13. *דודי לי* is rendered in *š* in an exceptional manner, *ܕܕܝܐ ܕܝܐ* instead of the usual *ܕܕܝܐ ܕܝܐ*; cf. 1:14 where, too, *דודי לי* is conceived in *š* as a pleonasm for *דודי*.

14. For *בכרמ* *š* has *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*.

15. For *עני יונה=של יונה* *š* has *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ* is obviously the meaning of the simile. A like rendering of the same phrase is given by *š* in 4:1, see Ginsburg, *The Song of Songs*, p. 140.

16. The second *א* is omitted in *š^p š^w š^l*, but found in all other witnesses. Bar Hebraeus has *ܐܚܝܬܐ*, undoubtedly a corruption.¹—*רצונה* is translated by *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*; cf. *š*'s rendering of *רענן בהיכלי* in Dan. 4:1.

17. For *ביתנו* *š* gives *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*, a reading which is accepted by Grätz, Ehrlich, Zapletal, and many others.—*רהטבו* is translated in *š* by *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*, a rendering which is supported by LXX and Symmachus; cf. the targumic translation of *ברזל עשות* in Ezek. 27:19. The Hebrew word is not found elsewhere, and its meaning can only be conjectured. According to F. Delitzsch (*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 143) it is an Assyrian loan word *rātu*, but Nöldeke thinks the word came originally from the Syriac (cf. *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ* in Thomas of Marga [ed. Budge], I, 271) and means "boards."²—*ברותים* is correctly rendered in *š* by *ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*; cf. *š*'s translation of

¹ Cf. Rahlfs in ZATW, IX (1889), 171.

² See Budde, *loc. cit.*, pp. 6 f.

כְּבֹרֶשׁ in Hos. 14:9. The Syriac word is very likely a derivation from the Greek *κέρπος* and is also found in the Talmud, ארז קחרס, Rosh Hash. 23a.

CHAPTER II

1. אֲנִי is not translated in §, but instead we find פִּי . . . = *אני*, owing to which a meaningless sentence results (כְּחִבְצֶלֶת הַשִּׁירֹן) (שׁוֹשַׁנֵּת הָעֵמְקִים).—חִבְצֶלֶת: Opinions differ as to the exact meaning of this Hebrew word as it stands here and in Isa. 35:1: LXX, *άνθος*; Vulgate, *flos*; Aquila, *καλύκωσις*, “rosebud”; Gr.-Ven., *ρόδον*. In both halves of the present verse § has חֲבַמְבָּ, while in Isa. 35:1 it is rendered by *autumo crocus* which is adopted here by many commentators.¹ הַשִּׁירֹן is translated in §, not by מִסְכָּן as would be expected,² but by מִסְכָּן,³ which in connection with מִסְכָּן is used for the translation of בְּרוֹשִׁים. See above, *ad* 1:17.—For הָעֵמְקִים the singular חֲמַמְבָּ is used in §.

2. כְּשׁוֹשַׁנָּה is translated in § by מִסְכָּן, as if it were a plural.

3. For כְּחַפְזָה § has מִסְכָּן; presumably he took it as a collective noun.—For בְּעֵצִי § used חֲמַמְבָּ, for which compare the rabbinic usage of this word in the phrase אֵיךְ אֵיךְ קִיסִין (see Eccl. R. 7, 6). A resemblance of this root is traceable in the expression וְאַתָּה פְּרִיָּה יְקוֹסֶס found in Ezek. 17:9.—§ seems to have read פְּרִירִי = פִּירִי for פְּרִירִי; but סִאֶס has אֶסֶס.

4. For הִבְיֵאֲנִי § has אֶחְכַּמְבָּ, as if it were written הִבְיֵאֲנִי in the imperative plural, which agrees with *εἰσαγάγετέ με* of LXX and Symmachus.—For וְדַגְלִי § gives *הַדְגֵּל*, as if vocalized *הַדְגֵּל* in the imperative. The LXX agrees with this reading, having *τάξατε*, while the Vulgate reads *ordinavit* = *הַדְגֵּל*, and Symmachus has *ἐπισωρεύσατε*. These readings do not involve any different consonantal Hebrew text. Commentators find nothing in favor of this variant.

5. Instead of סִמְכוֹנִי § seems to have read שִׁימוֹנִי, for it has מְחַמְבָּ.—בְּאִשִּׁישׁוֹת is translated in § by מְחַמְבָּ, a word which is more or less equivalent to the Hebrew רִכּוֹת or חֲלָקוֹת. § seems to have taken this difficult word, which is subject to divers interpre-

¹ See Grätz, *loc. cit.*, p. 46.

² Cf. Isa. 33:9; 35:2; 65:10; and see Bernstein in *ZDMG*, III, 393.

³ Cf. Isa. 41:19 where בְּרוֹשׁ is rendered in § by the same word.

tations,¹ as a diminutive of **אַשָׁה** (cf. **אַיִשׁוֹן** from **אִישׁ**), in the sense of the German *Frauchen*. However, Syriac not being in possession of any diminutives,² § evidently substituted the generally used **ܡܠܚܬܐ** = "gentleness."—**ܪܦܕܘܢܐ**, as accompanying **ܬܦܪܚܝܡ**, is rather difficult for the Syriac translator to translate by **ܡܠܚܬܐ** (*v. ܡܠܚܬܐ*), which would be a possible rendering of **רַפֵּד** or **רַבֵּד**;³ he therefore uses instead **ܡܠܚܬܐ** = **ܡܠܚܬܐ**, **ܬܦܪܚܝܡ**; cf. the rabbinic phrase **כִּיךָ עֵיר מוֹקֶפֶת חוּמָה**.

6. **ܬܪܚܬ** = **ܬܪܚܬ** renders it very correctly **ܬܪܚܬ** as in 8:3.⁴

7. **ܬܪܚܬ** **ܐܬܚܬܐ**, but § correctly **ܬܪܚܬ**, since it refers to **ܒܢܐ**.—For **ܒܢܐ** **ܝܪܘܫܠܐܡ** § has **ܐܬܚܬܐ**; but in most places § omits the vocative **ܐܬܚܬܐ**.⁵

8. **ܐܬܚܬܐ** has **ܐܬܚܬܐ**, with which compare LXX, **ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἡ κε**; but all other Syriac witnesses read **ܐܬܚܬܐ**.⁶—**ܐܬܚܬܐ** is translated in § by **ܡܠܚܬܐ**, a word used in rabbinic literature in the same sense; cf. **שׁוֹרֵר עֶשֶׂר אַמְיִן**, Berachoth 54b.

9. **ܐܬܚܬܐ** is rendered in § by **ܐܬܚܬܐ**, the same word used above⁷ in translating **ܐܬܚܬܐ**.—For **ܐܬܚܬܐ** § has **ܐܬܚܬܐ** in the singular.⁸—**ܐܬܚܬܐ** against all other texts gives **ܐܬܚܬܐ** instead of **ܐܬܚܬܐ**.⁹—**ܐܬܚܬܐ** is rendered in § by **ܐܬܚܬܐ**; but Bar Hebraeus has **ܐܬܚܬܐ**.¹⁰

¹ The LXX translates **אַשִׁישׁוֹשׁ** by *ἐν κύβω*, and the Vulgate by *floribus*; but Ibn Ezra, though giving no source, explains it as "vessels of glass full of wine," cf. B. P'sachin 36b **כלי זכוכית מלאות יין**. But Rashi (comm. *ad loc.*) allows all possible interpretations. A. Clarke (*Commentary on the Old Testament*, Vol. III) claims that "the original word means some kind of cordials with which we are unacquainted." Gesenius, followed by many others, seems to suggest the correct explanation. He derives **אַשִׁישׁוֹשׁ** from **אַשֶׁשׁ** and connects it with the Arabic *ʿassasa*, "to found" or "establish," and so "cakes of pressed fruit," i.e., "grape cakes." See II Sam. 6:19 (with Driver's note); I Chron. 16:3; Isa. 16:7 (with Cheyne's note); Hos. 3:1 (adds **עֲנָבִים**). Cf. also the rendering of Symmachus.

² Cf. above, *ad* 1:6.

³ Cf. *ad* 3:10.

⁴ § differs from all other editions of the Syriac text of Canticles in spelling of **ܬܪܚܬܐ** wherever the others have **ܬܪܚܬܐ**. See also 4:8, 14; 5:2, 11; 7:6; 8:3.

⁵ Cf., e.g., 1:5. See, however, Bar Hebraeus *ad loc.* There are in Bar Hebraeus' notes variants which can be explained only with the help of the LXX.

⁶ Owing to the similarity between **ܐܬܚܬܐ** and **ܐܬܚܬܐ**, **ܐܬܚܬܐ** was lost in §. See Rahlfs, ZATW, IX (1889), 170.

⁷ 2:7 and cf. also verse 17 and other places.

⁸ Cf. again verse 17, while in 8:14 § has a plural noun.

⁹ Very likely a misprint as above (see n. 6, Rahlfs, *loc. cit.*).

¹⁰ See Thorndyke's collation in Walton's Polyglot Bible, VI, 30.

כחלנו is translated in \mathfrak{S} by אש; cf. Isa. 38:2, where אל הקיר is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by אש.—For משגיה \mathfrak{S} uses מנע which agrees with \mathfrak{S} in Isa. 14:17, where ישגיהו is translated by ננע; cf. the rabbinic expression לא דק ביה מציץ. —לא דק ביה מציץ which agrees with the Aramaic מרכין = “to incline”; very likely because of the position the body assumes at the manner of looking described in this passage.—הרכים, Aramaic הרכא¹ is translated in \mathfrak{S} by צירם = ציר.

10. רעיתי יפתי is translated in \mathfrak{S}^{pw1} by מנע מנע, but \mathfrak{S}^m transposes it מנע מנע.

11. כי הנה הסתו עבר הגשם חלה הלך לו. \mathfrak{S}^{pw1} omits הגשם חלה, while all other available witnesses have these words. Very likely this omission in \mathfrak{S}^{pw1} is due to *ὁμοιοτέλευτον* after סאן חכ. Gottheil's² emendation in accordance with the LXX is altogether unnecessary.³—For הלך \mathfrak{S} has והלך = סאן.

12. הסתו is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by הסט, from the root סט which is equal to the Hebrew root אטב; cf. the rabbinic expression הסט, דברו נביאים לשון הבאי, Hullin 90b.—הסט: \mathfrak{S} renders it by הסט, a translation supported by most of the ancient versions.⁴ Accordingly many modern scholars translate this word “pruning” of the vine, and the form of the word is in favor of this, though it does not occur elsewhere in the Bible with this meaning. Compare the analogous expression עת הקציר = “the time of harvest” in Jer. 51:33. In the light of this expression the translation “the time of pruning” is thoroughly justified. Nearly all the Jewish commentators,⁵ except רשב”ם, as well as some modern critics reject this as being rather tame in so poetic a passage, and explain הסט as derived from זטיר,

¹ See Jastrow, *Targ. Dict.*

² See his *Zur Textkritik der Pešittā* in Mitteil. d. Akad.-Orient. Vereins zu Berlin, No. 2, p. 27.

³ See Rahlfs's in *ZATW*, IX (1889), 170 f. and cf. Göttsberger, *Bar Hebraeus*, etc., p. 104, n. 1.

⁴ LXX *της τομης*, Vulg. *putationis*, and the Targum קטור. Cf. also K. Marti, *Die fünf Megilloth*, etc., pp. 10 f.

⁵ Ibn Ezra has the above explanation, but rejects it because of the season of the year; the time for pruning being past when the vines are in bloom. “But there is what is called summer pruning, one purpose of which is to help in the formation of the fruit, or blossom-buds of fruit trees. This is done while the shoots are yet young and succulent so that they may in most cases be nipped off with the thumb-nail. The time for this would be just before the blooming, and both pruning and blooming would be processes appropriate to spring.”—A. Harper, *The Song of Solomon* (Cambridge, 1907), p. 15.

which actually occurs a number of times with the meaning "song," and refer it to the strophe **וְקוֹל הַתּוֹר נִשְׁמַע בְּאַרְצֵנוּ**. But there is no instance of this word being used of the singing of birds; it always refers to human singing.¹

13. § seems to have misunderstood the word **הַנְּטוּה** (Arabic **حَنَطَ**), as the translator rendered it by **נְתָנָה** = **נָתַן**.—For **פְּגִיָּה** § has **פַּעְחָה**; cf. II Kings 4:39, where **פְּקוּעַת שִׁדָּה** is rendered in § by **גַּפְנִים וְסִמְדָּרִים** = **عُفْطَانٌ وَسَمْدَرَانٌ**.—**וְהַגְּפָנִים סִמְדָּר**.—In § the Keri is followed in the reading of **לֶךְ קוֹמִי** instead of the Kethib **לְכִי רַעִיָּה**, which is the case in LXX.—**יַפְתִּי** precedes **רַעִיָּה** in §.

14. §^m agrees with the Hebrew in commencing this verse with **וְיֹנְתִי** while §^{pw1} takes it to be the closing word of the preceding verse.³—For **הַמְדִּירָה** § gives **וְשִׁלָּה**,⁴ as if it were **הַמְדִּירָה**, instead of something like **וְשִׁלָּה**, which would be more appropriate here.—For **הַשְּׁמִיעִנִי** § has **וְשִׁמְעֵנִי**.—§ uses for **עֵרֵב** the word **מַחְוֶה**, whereby the words **נָעִים** in 1:16 (see above); **נָחָה** and **מַחְוֶה** in Ezek. 20:41 are tendered in §.

15. **מִזְחַבְלֵי מִחַבְלִים כְּרָמִים** is translated in § by **מִזְחַבְלֵי מִחַבְלֵי כְּרָמִים**.—For **סִמְדָּר** see above, 2:13.

17. **עַד שִׁיקָךְ עַד שִׁפּוּחַ** is translated in § by **עַד שִׁיקָךְ עַד שִׁפּוּחַ** (cf. 4:6). The idea of **פּוּחַ** blowing (wind) is closely related to cold, frozen, etc.—For **וְנָסָה** § seems to have read **וְנָסָה**, for it has **וְנָסָה**, the Hebrew root of which is in most cases closely allied with **צָל**, although there are other verbs, such as **בָּרַח**, **הִלָּךְ**, **עָבַר**, etc., available for the same purpose.⁵—Instead of **סִב** § evidently read **שׁוּב** or **הִסָּב**, for it renders it by the word **חָזַר**.—**הָרִי בָתָר** is rendered in § by **הָרִי בְּשִׁמְמִים** = **גְּבוּשׁ מִשְׁמָנִי** (cf. 8:14). The LXX translates it by **ἐπὶ ὄρη κοιλαμάτων** = "mountains of ravines," deriving it from the verb **בָּתַר** (Gen. 15:10). F. Perles (in his *Analekten*, p. 22) is of the opinion that **הָרִי בָתָר** is to be explained as an abbreviation of **בֵּית רִבִּים**.

¹ See, e.g., Isa. 25:5; and in plural II Sam. 23:1; Ps. 95:2, etc.

² For the exact meaning of **סִמְדָּר** in the Syriac Bible, see *Notes sur la Pessitto* by Rubens Duval in *REJ*, XIV (1887), 49–54.

³ LXX has **יֹנְתִי** twice; once at the end of verse 13 and again at the opening of verse 14.

⁴ Cf. the phrase **עָשׂוּ סִיג לְתוֹרָה** in Abboth I, 1.

⁵ Cf. II Kings 20:10; Jer. 6:4; Ps. 102:12; 109:23; 144:4; Job 14:2.

CHAPTER III

1. **אח שאהבה נפשי**, which also occurs in the three immediately following verses, is rendered in § by **אחי אהבתי**, except in verse 4 where it is translated **אחי אהבתי**.

2. For \aleph $\mathfrak{s}^{\text{pwl}}$ gives \mathfrak{u} while $\mathfrak{s}^{\text{mau}}$ has \mathfrak{n} .— וְיַחְבֹּתֶיךָ is translated in \mathfrak{s} by וְיַחְבֹּתֶיךָ from the Greek $\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\upsilon\varsigma$.

3. The question of **את שאלה, נפשי ראיתם** is introduced in § by **למה** which is equivalent to **למה**.

4. For ילדתי § has לילדתי,¹ although לילדתי would probably be a more suitable expression in view of the fact that לילדתי² is rendered in § by לילדתי.

5. For the Syriac translation of this verse see 2:7.

6. בעֲטֶרֶת=אֶחָד, חָגָא, זָנָא by שְׁ is translated in כְּחִמְרוֹת עֵשָׂן. עֵשָׂן which is equivalent to the targumic rendering of the phrase עֵשָׂן, וְהָרַי סִינִי עֵשָׂן, in Exod. 19:18.³—For מְקַטֵּר שְׁ has מִמְּסַחֵם=מִבְּשֻׁמִּים, while Aquila's rendering ἀπό θυμιάματος implies a change in the vocalization to make it read מְקַטֵּר,⁵ which is also represented by Jerome and the Targum.—For מֵר וּלְבוֹנָה שְׁ has מִמְּסַחֵם.—אֶבֶקֶת is translated in שְׁ by מִסָּא, the same word used in the Syriac translation of אֶבֶק רַגְלִי in Nah. 1:3.—רוּכַל is translated in שְׁ not by רִכְזָא,⁶ as would be expected, but by the word בְּשֻׁמִּים=מִמְּסַחֵם. However, considering the fact that the LXX exceptionally renders here this word by μυρεψου while the Vulgate translates it by pigmentarii instead of negotiator or institor, as would be expected,⁷ it may safely be assumed that the Syriac text is here incorrectly vocalized. Instead of מִמְּסַחֵם, as Sionita gives, it should be read בְּשֻׁמִּים=מִמְּסַחֵם.⁸

7. ישראל is given in $\mathfrak{s}^{\text{pwl}} \text{ יִשְׂרָאֵל}$, while \mathfrak{s}^{m} eliminates from the word the final letter ל .

¹ Cf. Hos. 2:7 where this word occurs once more.

² See, e.g., 6:9, but cf. 8:5.

³ See also Joel 3:3.

⁴ See Grätz, *Schir Haschirim*, *ad loc.*

⁵ Cf. Joseph Reider in *JQR* (N.S.), IV, 606.

⁶ Cf., e.g., Ezek. 17:4; 27:3 seq.

⁷ See Ezek. 27.

⁸ For the meaning of this word consult Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus Syr.* s.v.

8. For ܡܠܡܕܝ ܟ has ܡܠܡܕܝ , and for ܒܠܝܠܐܘܬ the Syriac translator very likely read ܗܠܝܠܐܘܬ , for ܟ translates it by ܕܡܠܚܐ .— ܥܠ ܝܪܚܝܐ is rendered in ܟ by ܕܡܠܚܐ ; cf. the rabbinic expression ܡܠܚܐ ܐܝ ܕܕܦܢܐ ܐܝ in Baba Metzia 23b.

9. ܡܠܚܐ from the Aramaic ܡܠܚܐ ¹ is translated in ܟ^{pw1} ܡܠܚܐ (while in ܟ^{m} it is rendered by ܡܠܚܐ) which in its usual meaning equals the Hebrew ܡܠܚܐ .²

10. ܡܠܚܐ is translated in ܟ by ܡܠܚܐ ,³ the same Syriac word used in rendering the phrase ܡܠܚܐ ܝܥܘܕܝ in Job 17:13.— ܕܡܠܚܐ is incorrectly rendered in ܟ^{pw1} by ܡܠܚܐ , while ܟ^{m} and Thorndyke's collation (p. 30) have the better reading ܡܠܚܐ .— ܡܠܚܐ is taken in ܟ in a changed meaning and is rendered by ܡܠܚܐ = "cover."— ܡܠܚܐ is translated in ܟ by ܡܠܚܐ ; cf. above, *ad* 1:16.

11. Instead of ܡܠܚܐ ܟ has ܡܠܚܐ = ܡܠܚܐ , without the ܡ copulativum.

CHAPTER IV

1. ܡܠܚܐ is rendered here by ܡܠܚܐ ; likewise in 6:7, while in verse 3 of the present chapter the word ܡܠܚܐ is used instead.— ܡܠܚܐ (although commonly taken to refer to the oriental veil called in Hebrew ܡܠܚܐ) is rendered in ܟ by ܡܠܚܐ = ܡܠܚܐ , while in Isa. 47:2 where ܡܠܚܐ occurs once more ܟ correctly has ܡܠܚܐ .⁴ It seems that throughout the Old Testament, the root ܡܠܚܐ is taken, in ܟ , in the sense of "silence," except in Lev. 25:23 where ܡܠܚܐ is translated by ܡܠܚܐ . . . ܡܠܚܐ which evidently seems to be a

¹ Cf. the rabbinic phrase ܡܠܚܐ ܝܪܚܝܐ . It is also possible that it is to be explained as a noun formed like ܡܠܚܐ , ܡܠܚܐ , and derived from the verb ܡܠܚܐ . See Ginsburg *ad. loc.*; Delitzsch, *Das Hohelied*, p. 23; and Grätz, *loc. cit.* Some of their predecessors endeavored to Hellenize this word by deriving it from the Greek φορεῖον which means a litter in which one is borne. While this may be its correct meaning the derivation of the word is uncertain. Cf. in this connection the rabbinic phrase ܡܠܚܐ ܝܪܚܝܐ , Num. R. 12,215a and cf. Cant. R. 19a, b

² See Soṭa 9, 14.

³ Cf. above, *ad* 2:5.

⁴ It seems that LXX agrees here with ܟ , for it has $\text{τῆς αἰσχρότητός σου}$; but in Isa. 47:2, LXX gives τὸ κακαλόγημά σου and Vulg. has *turpitudinem tuam*; but here Vulg. renders it by *absque eo, quod intrinsecus latet*, the idea of which is developed in a more elaborate manner by A. Calmet (*Commentaire littéral sur le Vieux Testament*, etc., Vol. V, p. 95, ll. 13 f.) in the following words: "Vos yeux sont des yeux de colombe; sans ce que la pudeur, et la modestie tiennent caché."

combination of the two versions, for in Lev. 25:30 לצמיתת is rendered by שגלשו¹ alone.—שגלשו This variously interpreted word is translated in § by שָׁעֲלָה = שָׁחַם. The translator evidently thought this verb refers to כָּעָר, instead of connecting it with הָעֵזִים, and therefore translates it in the singular.—For מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד § correctly gives מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד, but Bar Hebraeus has מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד. This omission of , מִדֶּר in §^b is probably due to his carelessness or to that of the scribe of the Bible MS used by him.²

2. הקצובות (derived from קָצַב like קָצַב, קָצַב, קָצַב in the sense of “hewn”) is translated in § מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד = מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד,³ a word which, though not quite exactly, nevertheless expresses its meaning and is supported by both LXX and Vulgate.—For שָׁעֲלָה §^{pw1} gives שָׁחַם, but all other witnesses read שָׁחַם.—Since שָׁחַם refers to הקצובות, it is correctly rendered in § by שָׁחַם = שָׁחַם.⁴ The same holds true also of בָּהֶם, § שָׁחַם = בָּהֶם.

3. If the clauses in this verse and half of the following verse be arranged in accordance with § the Hebrew would read:⁵

נָחוּט הַשָּׁנִי שִׁפְחוּתִיךָ, מִדְּבָרְךָ נֶאֱוָה כַּפְלָה הָרִמּוֹן. רִקְתָּ
מִבַּעַד לְצִמְתָּךְ כִּמְגֹדֶל דָּרֵךְ צוּאֲרֶךְ בְּנוֹי לְחִלְפוּת וְג’

For מִדְּבָרְךָ §^{pw1} has מִדְּבָרְךָ = מִדְּבָרְךָ, but Bar Hebraeus and §^{aum} preserve what may be considered the older reading which agrees with the Hebrew.⁶ The word does not mean “speech” (LXX, λαλία; Gr.-Ven., διάλογος; Vulg., eloquium), but the “organ of speech,” to agree with the other half of the sentence.—For נֶאֱוָה §^{pw1} has נֶאֱוָה, but Bar Hebraeus and §^{au} present נֶאֱוָה.⁷ Compare the expression כִּי לֹךְ יֵאָחֵז in Jer. 10:7.—כַּפְלָה is in §^{pw1} rendered by the plural

¹ This word seems to be connected with the Arabic جَلَس though Grätz would not acknowledge it. But Levy (*Neuhebr. Wörterbuch, sub voce*) derives it from the late Jewish-Aramaic noun גִּלְשָׁא and translates this passage, “which go by in waves.”

² See Rahlfs, *ZATW*, IX (1889), 170.

³ Cf. II Kings 4:6 where קָצַב is translated in § by פָּסַם, but there it is connected with עָץ.

⁴ Thorndyke in his collation (p. 30): “Poc. מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד 6. 4. cum o in Poc. ubi Uss. מִדֶּר גִּלְעָד.”

⁵ But cf. 4:7 which agrees with the Hebrew text.

⁶ Cf. Rahlfs, *loc. cit.*, p. 166.

⁷ See *ibid.*

4. לחלפיות is translated in § by חנ חנ, for the meaning of which compare the rabbinic expression מחר אריג תיג.⁴ The Syriac word חנ allows many explanations,⁵ as does also the Hebrew word חלפיות.—המגן is correctly translated in § by the plural סמך, the same word used in § to translate the word מגן wherever it occurs in the Bible, except in the following cases: The expression אנכי מגן לך in Gen. 15:1 is rendered by انا اسعد. In Deut. 33:29 the phrase מגן עזרך is translated مسمك جوفك ايمك. Likewise חלוי is correctly translated in the plural ملوك.

6. For הַצִּלֵּלִים צ^{pwl} gives הָצֵן , while צ^{um} and two Harvard MSS have הָצֵת .—For אֵלֶיךָ לִי צ gives אֵלֵי . The translator evidently took it as an invitation to the beloved one= לִבִּי .—The expressions אֵל הָרַר and וְאֵל גְּבֻעָה are translated in צ in the plural חֲבֵדִים and סֻחַדִּים respectively.

¹ *Ibid.*

³ Cf., e.g., Num. 33:55.

⁵ Slonita in his Latin translation of § renders ܠܒܠܐ by *cum balaustiis*; but cf., e.g., Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, *sub voce*.

⁶ For various renderings of this word see modern biblical commentaries *ad loc.* According to Grätz, Budde, and others this word is really a Greek loan word, *τηλῶπις* or *τηλωπίς*, "a distant prospect." Against this view see Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder*, p. 23, Anm. 8, 14, and Cannon, *The Song of Songs*, p. 127. The LXX takes it as a proper name *Θαλωπίς*. See also Margoliouth in the *Expositor*, January, 1900, p. 45.

Jonah 2:4). Such a word, even if it could mean "wave" in the singular, would be most inappropriate.¹ § presents a better and more suitable reading, ܡܠܚܐ = ܡܠܚ, and has the support of the LXX *κῆπος*, the Vulgate *hortus*, and some MSS.

13. ܫܠܝܚܬܗ is translated in § by ܡܠܬܬܗ which makes the meaning of the phrase more obscure.—ܡܡܝܢ is rendered by ܡܡܝܢ (cf. 5:16). Wherever ܡܡܝܢ occurs in the Bible it is translated in § by ܡܡܝܢ (cf. 6:11).—ܡܡܝܢ and ܡܡܝܢ are translated in § in the singular by ܡܡܝܢ and ܡܡܝܢ respectively.

14. ܡܡܝܢ is omitted in §, perhaps because it follows so closely ܡܡܝܢ.—For ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ §^{pw1} gives ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ, while §^m has ܡܡܝܢ.—ܡܡܝܢ is not translated in §.—Both ܡܡܝܢ and ܡܡܝܢ are rendered in § in the singular ܡܡܝܢ and ܡܡܝܢ respectively.

15. ܡܡܝܢ is rendered in § by the relative ܡܡܝܢ = ܡܡܝܢ.²

16. For ܡܡܝܢ § uses ܡܡܝܢ (cf. Targum on Prov. 25:23).—ܡܡܝܢ is represented in §^{pw1m} by ܡܡܝܢ, but Cod. Ussher has ܡܡܝܢ.³—Instead of ܡܡܝܢ § has ܡܡܝܢ = ܡܡܝܢ.—For ܡܡܝܢ § presents ܡܡܝܢ = ܡܡܝܢ, as does also the LXX *ἀρώματά μου*.—§, like the LXX and the Vulgate, begins the next chapter with ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ, but §^m follows the verse division of the Hebrew text.—For ܡܡܝܢ § has ܡܡܝܢ = ܡܡܝܢ.

CHAPTER V

1. In the Peshitta this verse really forms the second verse of the present chapter, the first verse beginning with ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ, etc., with which the preceding chapter closes.⁴ ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ is translated in § twice and § adds once more ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ, but all other witnesses translate it once, adding ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ.⁵ ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ is correctly translated in § by ܡܡܝܢ,⁶ while in Ps. 80:13 the same

¹ Ibn Ezra and some other Jewish commentators take ܡܡܝܢ to be the correct reading and explain it as synonymous with ܡܡܝܢ and identify it with ܡܡܝܢ (Josh. 15:19) which does mean "spring." So also does Hitzig, *Comm.*, p. 61.

² The ܡܡܝܢ copulativum is represented in LXX against § and Vulg.

³ See Thorndyke's collation, p. 30.

⁴ § counts this as the first verse of the chapter, except that it begins the chapter with ܡܡܝܢ, etc., of the previous verse, closing the passage with ܡܡܝܢ as LXX and Vulg. do.

⁵ Cod. Poc. has only ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ.

⁶ But Cod. Uss. ܡܡܝܢ.

word is rendered by **בשמי**, which should really be emended to **בשמי**, is translated in §, as well as in LXX, as if it read **בשמי** = **בשמי**.—For **אכלתי** §^{pw1} gives **אכלתי**, while §^{um} and two Harvard MSS have **אכלתי**.—**יערי** is translated in § by **יערי**,¹ while in I Sam. 14:27 the word **ערי** is used instead.—It seems that the LXX, Vulgate, and Peshitta took **דורים** as being synonymous with **רעים**, though both words are rendered in § by **דורי** and **רעי**.—For **שחו** § has the better reading **שחו** = **שחו** which is confirmed by LXX and Vulgate.—**ושכרי** is translated in § by **שכרי**, for the meaning of which compare the Hebrew expression **למען ספות הרוה** and the rabbinic phrase **שבקיה לרוי**, Sabbath 32b.

2. **דופק** is translated in § by **דופק**, for the meaning of which compare the expression **דא לרא נקשן** in Dan. 5:6. The LXX translates it by *κρούει ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ*. In explaining this passage some help may be gained from Judg. 19:22, the only other place in the Old Testament where the verb **דפק** is used in this sense. In the latter passage it is followed by **על הדלת**, LXX *κρούοντες ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ*. In view of this it is reasonable to suppose that the words have fallen out of the Hebrew text and the Greek reading may here be adopted, as it would improve the sense.—**חמתי** is rendered in § without the possessive suffix by **חמתי** = **חמתי**; so likewise in 6:9 (8).—For **טל** §^{pw1} has **טל**, while all other witnesses read **טל**.—For **קוצתי** § has **קוצתי** = **קוצתי**, while **רסיסי** is rendered by **רסיסי** = **רסיסי**.

3. **פשתי** is translated in § by **פשתי**, while in Isa. 32:11 **פשטה וערה** is rendered by **פשתי**, for the meaning of which compare the usage of the word in the rabbinic phrase **שומנין בשלהין** ו**הם העירות שנפשטו**, Sabbath 49a.—**אטנפם** is correctly rendered in § by **אטנפם** = **אטנפם**, since it refers to **רגלי**.

4. **הושיט** is rendered in § by **הושיט** = **הושיט**, while the phrase **ומעי המו עליו** is translated **ומעי המו עליו**.² The Vulgate has

¹ Curiously LXX translates this word by *ἄπρον μου* = **לחמי**; cf. also the Arabic version in the London Polyglot **جُبْرِى**, and Symmachus *δρυμόν*. But in view of the reading of Symmachus it may perhaps be conjectured that the original LXX reading was *ἀργρόν* of which *ἄπρον* is a corruption.

² Cf. Isa. 16:11 and Jer. 31:19 where the same word is differently rendered in the Peshitta, though not conveying the exact meaning of the Hebrew.

a similar rendering, *et venter meus intremuit ad tactum ejus*. See Ginsburg *ad loc.*

5. יִדְּי = ܝܕܝܢܝܢ is rendered in § in the singular ܢܬܦܪܐ. ܢܬܦܪܐ is in §^{pw1} translated in the plural by ܢܬܦܪܐ, but §^{uma} and a Harvard MS read ܢܬܦܪܐ. According to § it seems to refer to ܐܘܢܬܝܢ and the translator read it as if it were ܐܘܢܬܝܢ.—For ܐܠ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ § has ܐܠ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ.

6. ܐܠܡܢ is strangely translated in § by ܐܠܡܢ. So also Aquila ἔκλινεν, Symmachus ἀπονεύσας παραῖθθεν. In the LXX the word has been omitted by the copyist's error. See, however, 7:2 where the Ethpe'el of ܐܠܡܢ is used, while in Jer. 31:2 the phrase ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ is translated in § by ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ.

7. This verse in the Syriac, slightly differing from some of the available texts, is preserved in Ishodadh's Introduction to his *Commentary on Canticles*.² It agrees with §^{uma} and two Harvard MSS in omitting one ܐ in ܐܠܡܢ = ܐܠܡܢܐ and in the rendering of the phrase ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ.—For ܐܠܡܢ § has ܐܠܡܢ = ܐܠܡܢ. ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ is translated in the singular ܐܠܡܢ.

8. For the Syriac translation of ܐܠܡܢ, etc., see our note on 2:7.—For the question ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ § has the imperative ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ.

9. ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ is translated in § by ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ. The translator rendered ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ in the plural.

10. The Hebrew word ܐܠܡܢ is an adjective derived from ܐܠܡܢ = "to shine" or "glow," "to be brightly white," and is translated in § by ܐܠܡܢ. Here and in Lam. 4:7, where the word is used of the color of the skin,⁴ it means a clear, white complexion.—For ܐܠܡܢ the Syriac translator read ܐܠܡܢ and rendered it ܐܠܡܢ.—Like the LXX, the Peshitta translates ܐܠܡܢ in the plural.

¹ This word is derived from a doubtful root. It is perhaps equivalent to the Arabic حَبَق in the sense of ܐܠܡܢ; cf. Brown-Briggs-Driver, *Hebrew Lexicon*.

² See Diettrich, *Ishodadh's Stellung*, p. xviii.

³ Cf. the talmudic idiom ܐܠܡܢ ܕܢܬܦܪܐ. San. 65b.

⁴ In Lam. 4:7 the phrase is "more *tsach* than *milk*," contrasted with "darker than blackness." In Isa. 18:4 the word ܐܠܡܢ is taken in § as being identical with ܐܠܡܢ and is rendered by ܐܠܡܢ.

11. For כחם § has כאבן = אבן חפץ,¹ a rendering which agrees with that of Aquila, λιθρα τοῦ χρυσίου.² פז is translated in § כשל יונים.³ תלחלים occurs in the Bible only here, and is derived from תל or תלל. It is very likely a diminutive form of the latter or an intensifying form like טלטלה, הלחלה.⁴ Its exact meaning is not known. § renders it פשוטות = מעמל. For שחרות §^m has ושחרות = שחרות.

12. In this verse § evidently does not draw any comparison between eyes and doves as the Hebrew text does, but indicates rather a reading of עיני יונים, עיני עיני יונים, for it has כשל יונים = אבן, מתן; cf. above, *ad* 1:15 and 4:1. So also the LXX, Vulgate, and other versions.—For אפיק § has here מפה, but in some other places⁵ the word is rendered by נסן, עימן, etc.—רחצות is correctly translated in § הרחצות = שטף.—For ישובות § has וישובות = שטף, while נלאת is rendered in § by מחבב; evidently the translator did not consider it a parallel to אפיק. In Ezek. 28:17 where this word occurs again § translates it מחבב.⁶

13. כערגת הבשם: The Syriac translator correctly read this phrase in the plural and accordingly rendered it by אבן מחבב. פערגות הבשמים = שטף. So also Aquila, but LXX translates it φιάλαι, which is, however, difficult to understand. The original Greek reading probably was πασιαί as in Aquila and Symmachus. This gives much better sense than the Hebrew and is supported by the

¹ The word כחם is variously translated in §; see, e.g., Ps. 49:10; Prov. 25:12; Dan. 10:5, etc., and cf. the talmudic phrase כיפי דברדא and the targumic translation of (Job 30:6) by ואבניא וכפים.

² The rendering of פז כחם in LXX is a compound of καί and a transliteration of פז. Some of the LXX MSS present various readings (see Cannon, *Song of Songs*, p. 122) all of which suggest a reading פז (perhaps אפז, Jer. 10:9, LXX Μωφας; or Dan. 10:5, LXX Ωφας). Delitzsch (*Comm.*, Engl. transl., 1891, p. 100) seems to be right in maintaining that the two Hebrew words are in apposition and give an excellent sense without the γ. Probably the Greek translator thought the conjunction necessary and added its equivalent καί to improve the sense. But the MT seems to be better.

³ But cf. the Syriac translation of the same word in Lam. 4:2; Ps. 21:4, etc.

⁴ Cf. the talmudic phrase תלי תלים של הלכות in Menachoth 29b.

⁵ Cf., e.g., Ezek. 31:12 and Joel 1:20.

⁶ For the incorrectness of this passage in the Syriac text of the London Polyglot see Göttsberger, *Bar Hebraeus*, etc., p. 104, n. 1.

15. For **הַמִּסְדִּים** ḥmṣdīm = **הַמִּסְדִּים**, and for **אֲדָנִי** ʾādānī gives here **סַמְחָא**, otherwise translated **סַמְחָא**; cf. the rendering of Targum Jonathan **חַוְרִיָּן דְּכֶסֶה** for **אֲדָנִי כֶסֶה** in Exod. 26:19.—For the Syriac translation of **פֶּזַע** see our note on 5:11.—**מִרְאֵהוּ** is here not translated by the usual **סִפְסֵה**, but by **חֲזֻזָּה** = **סִפְסֵה**. The translator evidently took it as a fitting parallel to **שׁוּקִיָּה**.—For **כְּלִבְנוֹן** klibnōn ḥ has **אִמְרָה**, and for **בַּחֲרִי** ḥ gives **וּבַחֲרִי** for which see above, *ad* 5:10.

⁶ Cf. Gen. 38:14 where Targum has ואתקנת and § used אֶתְּקַנְתָּ for ותתעלה.

16. מִמִּתְקִים, "sweets," is a collective noun like מִשְׁמַנִּים, and is translated here כִּיעֵרֹת מִחֻקֹּת = אִם חֲפִצָּהּ וְשֶׁכֶּה; cf. the phrase מִתִּיהֵבִין translated in § as וְכִלְיֹ = סֶסְנִיָּה; cf. the phrase in Ezra 7:19.—§ as well as the LXX and Vulgate close this chapter with the first verse of the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

1. For שִׁנְבִקְשֵׁנוּ = נִשְׁכַּחְנוּ § has וְנִבְקִשְׁנוּ.

2. This forms the first verse of the present chapter in the Syriac Bible.—For לַעֲרִיגוֹת § has וְלַעֲרִיגוֹת הַבָּשִׁם.—The infinitives לַעֲרִיגוֹת and וְלִלְקֹט are correctly rendered in § by the final verbs נִלְקֹט and יִלְקֹט.

4. The geographical proper name תִּרְצָה, early applied to Samaria, is rendered in § not by תִּרְצָה, as would be expected, but by כִּרְצוֹן = אִם עֲנִינוּ. Likewise LXX, E', ὡς εὐδοκία; Aquila, κατ' εὐδοκίαν; Symmachus, εὐδοκατῆ; Theodotion and E', εὐδοκῶ, instead of the usual Θερσά. The Vulgate, too, uses *suavis* instead of the expected *Thersa*, and the Targum homiletically renders it by בִּזְמֶן רֵעוּתִי. It is hard indeed to account for these senseless renditions found in the ancient versions, while they translated the phrase נְאוֹה כִּירוּשָׁלַם correctly. Considering the fact that Tirsah does not belong to the few unknown cities of the Bible and that in the Bible cities are frequently compared to beautiful women,² it can only be explained that the ancient translators found the text before them either archaic or mystical; and to be either of these it must have been an old text. It may also be possible that we have here a mannerism which is paralleled in rabbinic hermeneutics (נוֹטְרִיקוֹן) and consists in breaking up a pluriliteral into two elements.—For כְּנִדְגָלוֹת the translator, following his interpretation of דָּגוּל in verse 10, uses אִם חֲפִצָּהּ, for the meaning of which compare the phrase אִישׁ בַּחֹר in II Chron. 14:17 and other places.³

¹ Cf. above, *ad* 4:11. The word חֲפִצָּהּ is frequently used in § to translate the words נִפְתָּה, יִעֲרָה, צִפְיָחִית, while in Neh. 8:10 this expression is omitted.

² See Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, IV, 779.

³ See, however, above, *ad* 2:4, and Ps. 20:6.

6. The word הרחלים is interpreted in § like קצובות in 4:2, see above, and translated by הגזוזות = גזזות, instead of by נמל as would be expected; cf., e.g., Gen. 31:38. Likewise the LXX, which adds also the phrase כחות השני שפוחית ומדברך נאה from 4:3.—For שכלם § correctly has שכל = שכל. שכל is here translated in the singular, though above, 4:2, the same word is rendered by שכלם.—For בהם § correctly gives בהם = בהם.

8. For **המה** § correctly has **המה=לה**.—For **ושמנים** §^{pw1} has **זע**, while §^m gives **זע=ענה**.—**פילגשים** is translated in § by **זע**; cf. the talmudic phrase **את הדרך** in San. 31b. In a similar sense Johanan b. Zakai interpreted **דרך גבר** in Yalkut II, sec. 936.—**אין מספר** is rendered in § by **זע**, instead of by the usual **זע=לחן מספר**; cf., e.g., Ps. 104:25.

10. הנשקפה can be taken either as a passive or active participle, since נשקף is used in either way.¹ Here § takes it as active and

¹ Cf. Judg. 5:23 and Num. 21:20.

translates it by ܡܠܟܐ .— ܡܠܟܐ is rendered in ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} by ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} = ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} (ܡܠܟܐ^{pl}). This translation was very likely arrived at by analogy with the phrase ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} (5:10), though in verse 4 of the present chapter the word is rendered differently.

11. ܡܠܟܐ is translated in ܡܠܟܐ by the plural ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} .—The word ܡܠܟܐ occurs twice in this passage. The first is taken in ܡܠܟܐ as a final verb and is translated ܡܠܟܐ , while the second is rendered by ܡܠܟܐ as if it were an infinitive.—For ܡܠܟܐ the singular form ܡܠܟܐ = ܡܠܟܐ is used in ܡܠܟܐ , while the singular form ܡܠܟܐ is rendered by ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} as if it were a plural.—The question ܡܠܟܐ is emphatically presented in ܡܠܟܐ by ܡܠܟܐ .

12. For ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} has ܡܠܟܐ while ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} has ܡܠܟܐ^{pl} .— ܡܠܟܐ is rendered in ܡܠܟܐ by ܡܠܟܐ which the translator connects with ܡܠܟܐ : ܡܠܟܐ , etc.—For ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ has ܡܠܟܐ = ܡܠܟܐ .—According to the Masora (though some MSS differ) ܡܠܟܐ are two words (Baer, p. 49). The " in ܡܠܟܐ seems to be *litera compaginis* and a mark of the construct state.² The word ܡܠܟܐ may be used to denote "companions," "attendants."³ In the LXX these words are rendered as if constituting a proper name; but in ܡܠܟܐ they are translated ܡܠܟܐ ,⁴ thereby rendering the meaning of the passage more obscure. There is the following very curious variant in this verse, preserved in a fragment of Origen: $\text{πατήρ Νασσών ὁ ἀρχων τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἀμυναδὰβ ἔθετό με ἑαυτοῦ εἰς ἄρματα}$.⁵ Apparently the one who is responsible for this reading had no idea what ܡܠܟܐ meant. Endeavoring to simplify the meaning of this passage, he used a gloss from I Chron. 2:10: $\text{Ἀμυναδὰβ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Νασσὼν ἀρχοντα τοῦ οἴκου Ἰούδα}$, which at first was perhaps only a marginal note. It is obvious that such a reading has no critical value whatsoever. It, however, exhibits the fact that the Greek translator was puzzled in rendering this phrase.

¹ The Syriac word should perhaps be vocalized ܡܠܟܐ instead of ܡܠܟܐ .

² See Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1910), sec. 90, 3, K. 1.

³ See Eccles. 4:16 and Ginsburg's *Commentary*. So Renan, Bruston, Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder*, p. 21, Anm. 1, 21.

⁴ ܡܠܟܐ is here used for ܡܠܟܐ without any regard for the existence of such words as ܡܠܟܐ , etc., which are usually used in such cases. For the meaning of this word see the Syriac translation of the phrase ܡܠܟܐ in ܡܠܟܐ and cf. the rabbinic phrase ܡܠܟܐ in ܡܠܟܐ in Exod. 16:5 and cf. the rabbinic phrase ܡܠܟܐ in ܡܠܟܐ in Shebiith 4, 42.

⁵ *Excerpta Procopiana ex Orig.*, ed. De la Rue, III, 101b.

CHAPTER VII

1. The first half of this verse forms in § verse 12 of the preceding chapter, and § begins the present chapter with **מִה תִּחְזֹר**, etc. Both the LXX and the Vulgate add this half verse to chapter 6 also.—**שׁוּבִי שׁוּבִי**: Ishodadh¹ has after the first **שׁוּבִי** the word **חֲזֹר**.—**וְנִחְזֹר** is translated in § by **ܨܨܝܬܐ**, with which compare the targumic use of **תְּחִוּרִין** for **רָאָה** in Prov. 23:33; cf. also the Syriac translation of **צֹפֶה** in verse 5 of the present chapter. But **תִּחְזֹר** is here translated **ܨܨܝܬܐ**. An opposite tendency is exhibited in 6:9 where two Hebrew synonyms are rendered by one Syriac word.—**בְּשׁוֹלֵמִית** is rendered by **ܒܫܠܡܝܬܐ** = **ܒܫܠܡܘܬܐ**. Aquila translates it by *ἐλρημέουσα*, while the LXX gives *ἡ Σουναμίτις* = **הַשּׁוֹנַמִּית**. This Greek reading may perhaps be due to the fact that the place Shunem changed its name in later days, and became known as Sohulem.²—**כְּמַחֲלֵת הַמַּחֲנִים** is rendered in § by **ܡܨܠܬܐ ܕܡܨܠܝܢܐ**. It seems that like the LXX, Vulgate, Symmachus, and most of the rabbinic commentators, because of the definite article **הַ**, § took **מַחֲנִים** as a dual form of **מַחֲנֶה**, and not as a proper name as do most of modern commentators (except Budde) and the Revised Version. The insertion of *ἡ ἐρχομένη*, though supported by the Syriac **ܡܨܠܬܐ**, has no claim to be admitted into the text.³

2. **רִגְלִיךָ** is here rendered by **ܕܥܝܢܐ**, though the translator could have used more suitable expressions such as **ܡܨܠܬܐ**, **ܡܨܠܬܐ**, etc.—**בַּת נְרִיב** is translated in § **ܒܬܐ ܢܪܝܒܐ**, for the meaning of which see our note on 6:12.—**הַמְּוִקִּי** is rendered here by **ܕܡܡܝܢܐ** (like-wise LXX, *πυθμολι*); but above, 5:6, the same word is translated **ܕܡܡܝܢܐ**.—**הַלְּאִים** is here rendered by **ܕܡܡܝܢܐ**, but in Prov. 25:12 **ܕܡܡܝܢܐ** and in Hos. 2:15 **ܕܡܡܝܢܐ** are used instead.

¹ Diettrich, *loc. cit.*, p. xix.

² "Sunem in tribu Issachar, et usque hodie vicus ostenditur nomine *Sulem*."—Lagarde, *Onom.*, 183, 284. There is an error in the Greek version *Σουρήμ* (*lege* Σουρήμ). See Harper, *Song of Solomon*, p. 47.

³ Those who maintain that **הַמַּחֲנִים** cannot be the name of the town Maḥanaim, as this never has the article, overlook the fact that here the word is in the genitive while the article is used to determine the *nomen regens*. See Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*, sec. 127a, b. The phrase means "the dance of Maḥanaim," and not, as the Jewish Publ. Soc. version gives, "dance of two companies." In Jeremiah the same place is called **רַמְתָּה** (31:14) and **הַרְמָתָה** (40:1).

7. **אֶהְבֶּהּ** is rendered in \S by ܐܗܒܗܐ = \S . Likewise the Vulgate *charissima*.¹—The Syriac rendering of **בַּתְּעֻגִים** must be explained in the light of the Masoretic rule governing the reading of Scripture. The rule is: Two words may often be written in a contracted form representing one word.² Thus in \S **בַּתְּעֻגִים** is divided into **בַּת עֻגִים** = ܒܬܥܘܓܝܡ. So also Aquila *θυγάτηρ τρυφῶν*.³ But LXX gives *ἐν τρυφαῖς σου* = **בַּתְּעֻגֵיךָ**. The reading of \S and Aquila is accepted by many scholars, such as Dalman, Budde, and others, as superior to that of the Masoretic text.

8. For **זֶה זֶה** \S has ܙܗܙܗ = \S .

9. For **אֲמַרְתִּי** \S correctly gives ܐܡܪܬܝ, but Ishodadh⁴ has ܐܡܪܬܝܐ. —For **אֶהְיֶה** \S has ܐܗܝܐ = \S . —The emphatic **נָא** is here omitted in \S , but see 3:2.

10. **הַחֹלֶךְ** is correctly rendered in \S by ܚܠܟܐ. —For **דֹּבֵב שִׁפְתֵי** \S has here ܕܒܒܫܦܬܝܐ, but see above, 1:4. —**יִשְׁנִים** is a clause out of which many commentators endeavored to extract a good sense. The reading of \S , ܕܡܢ ܫܦܬܝܐ = \S = **יִשְׁנִים** (?), **שִׁפְתֵי** is accepted by Geiger⁵ and is sustained by the LXX, *ἱκανούμενος χεῖλεσίν μου καὶ ὁδοῦσιν*. The Vulgate renders it in the third person, *labiisque et dentibus illius*. Of the ancient commentators, Jerome and Kimchi connect the word **דֹּבֵב** with **דָּבָה**, a calumny or evil rumor, or they may have read **דֹּבֵר** or **מְדַבֵּר**. But **דֹּבֵב** has no connection with **דָּבָה**, but is rather related to **זָב**, and means “to go softly,” hence the Syriac ܕܒܒܐ = “going softly,” “gliding,” etc. The Syriac translation which has the support of the other ancient versions is preferable to the Masoretic text.

11. **תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ** is translated in \S ܦܬܘܩܬܐ, the same root used in the Syriac rendering of **תְּשׁוּקָתְךָ** = \S = **אֶשֶׁךְ** = \S in Gen. 3:16.

12. For **לָכֵה** \S has ܒܐ = \S . —For **הַשְׂדֵּה** \S correctly gives ܠܫܕܐ = \S . —The plural **בַּכְּפָרִים** is rendered in \S in the singular ܒܚܦܪܐ = \S .

¹ Cf. Deut. 21:15.

² אלו כותבים דבר אחד וקוראים שנים. See מסכת סופרים, chapter 7.

³ See Reider in *JQR*, IV (N.S.), 610.

⁴ Diettrich, *loc. cit.*, p. xviii.

⁵ ܕܡܢ ܫܦܬܝܐ.

⁶ *Urschrift*, etc., p. 405.

13. For נשכימה § has ܢܫܚܝܡܗ=ܢܫܚܝܡܗ.—The plural ܠܚܡܝܡ is rendered in § as if it were in the singular ܠܚܡ=ܠܚܡܐ.—For פתח the Syriac translator read ܦܬܚܐ and rendered it ܦܬܚܐ.¹—For the Syriac of ܠܚܡܝܡ see our note on 2:13.—For ܠܚܡܐ § gives ܠܚܡܐ=ܠܚܡܐ.—ܠܚܡܐ is rendered in § by ܠܚܡܐ as if vocalized ܠܚܡܐ. So also in LXX; cf. our note on 1:2.

14. For מנדים § has ܡܢܕܝܡ, but some MSS read ܡܢܕܝܡ.²—ܡܢܕܝܡ is rendered in § by ܡܢܕܝܡ=ܡܢܕܝܡ.

CHAPTER VIII

1. ܠܚܡܝܡ is rendered in § by the Hiph'il ܠܚܡܝܡ=ܠܚܡܝܡ, though Cod. Uss. has ܠܚܡܝܡ.³—In ܠܚܡܝܡ § inserts the letter ܠ and thereby obtains the Aramaic ܠܚܡܝܡ (ܠܚܡܝܡ=ܠܚܡܝܡ). Accordingly the passage would read: ܡܢܝܢ ܠܚܡܝܡ ܠܚܡܝܡ ܠܚܡܝܡ.—ܠܚܡܝܡ is vocalized in § ܠܚܡܝܡ.—For ܠܚܡܝܡ § has ܠܚܡܝܡ, cf. 7:14.—ܠܚܡܝܡ is rendered in § by ܠܚܡܝܡ, though the translator would have found many other expressions for this word; cf., e.g., 5:7; Prov. 6:30; 23:22.

2. For ܠܚܡܝܡ § has ܠܚܡܝܡ.—ܠܚܡܝܡ: § has omitted this word. In its place we find, however, ܠܚܡܝܡ, brought in from 3:4. So does also the LXX, καὶ εἰς ταμεῖον τῆς συλλαβοῦσης μὲ. The Hebrew text is here suspicious and the commentators are not agreed as to who is to be the teacher, the ܠܚܡܝܡ or the mother. The word ܠܚܡܝܡ appears to have been obelized in the Hexapla, though found in the Vulgate. It is perhaps a marginal gloss and should be omitted from the Masoretic text. The reading of § and LXX keeps the whole clause in harmony with the wish in verse 1, and can be accepted.—For ܠܚܡܝܡ § has ܠܚܡܝܡ=ܠܚܡܝܡ.—For ܠܚܡܝܡ, the Syriac translation of ܠܚܡܝܡ, cf. above, ad 2:14.—ܠܚܡܝܡ is rendered in § by ܠܚܡܝܡ=ܠܚܡܝܡ. The same word is translated inexactly ܠܚܡܝܡ in Joel 1:5; 4:18; and Amos 9:13, but correctly rendered in Isa. 49:26 by ܠܚܡܝܡ. For ܠܚܡܝܡ § has ܠܚܡܝܡ as if it were vocalized ܠܚܡܝܡ. So also the Vulgate.

4. For the Syriac translation of ܠܚܡܝܡ see above, ad 2:7.—This verse is a repetition of 2:7 and 3:5 with the difference

¹ For the use of this word see Heller, *Untersuchungen*, etc., p. 62.

² See Thorndyke's collation, p. 30.

³ *Ibid.*

that instead of אֵם, we have here מִה which in this place has been considered to be a negative.¹ Certainly this particle has almost this sense in Job 6:11; 16:6; and 31:1, where the interrogative מִה is translated *ov* in the LXX and *non* in the Vulgate. Still there must be some reason for the substitution of מִה for אֵם. § uses here אֵל אֵל as in 2:7; 3:5, though this passage does not, like those, require so absolute a prohibition.

5. עֵלָה is correctly rendered in § by ܥܠܗܐ=העלה.—For מִחֲרַפְקָה § has ܡܚܪܦܩܬܐ=ומחרפקת.—For the first שְׂמִיָּה § gives ܫܡܝܐ=ושמיה.—ܩܒܠܬܐ is correctly translated in § ܩܒܠܬܐ in the feminine. Likewise ܐܡܝܐ=אִמִּי and ܝܠܕܬܐ=יְלִדְתִּי. This practice of § to convert the masculine pronouns into feminine is followed by many commentators. Accordingly they should read ܥܘܪܬܐ, ܥܘܪܬܐ, ܝܠܕܬܐ, ܐܡܐ, ܩܒܠܬܐ. The question is one of vowels, as the consonantal text is the same for both readings, and in all probability the feminine suffixes are correct. For ܩܒܠܬܐ § has ܩܒܠܬܐ very likely by analogy to the preceding strophe, but §^m follows the reading of the Masoretic text, ܩܒܠܬܐ=חבלה.

6. For the first ܕܠܚܝܬܐ § has ܕܠܚܝܬܐ,² but the second is rendered by ܕܠܚܝܬܐ=ܕܠܚܝܬܐ.—For ܩܪܝܬܐ § has ܩܪܝܬܐ=ܩܪܝܬܐ.—ܩܪܝܬܐ is translated ܩܪܝܬܐ, a word the use of which is also found in the talmudic טִנְנָה הִיחָה בִּלְבָם (Hagigah 15a).—The phrase רִשְׁפִּיהַּ is rendered in § by ܪܝܫܦܝܐ, though in other places where this phrase occurs the translator uses such expressions as ܪܝܫܦܝܐ, ܪܝܫܦܝܐ, ܪܝܫܦܝܐ, etc.³—According to Ben Naphtali, ܪܝܫܦܝܐ are two words. The Masora of Ben Asher read ܪܝܫܦܝܐ one word (Baer, pp. 51, 83; Ginsburg, *Crit. Intr.*, p. 386). The Syriac rendering ܪܝܫܦܝܐ suits either reading. The LXX *φλόγες αὐτῆς* suggests a plural form ܪܝܫܦܝܐ.

7. For ܕܠܚܝܬܐ § gives ܕܠܚܝܬܐ, but §^m has ܕܠܚܝܬܐ.—ܕܠܚܝܬܐ is rendered in § by ܕܠܚܝܬܐ, for the meaning of which compare ܕܠܚܝܬܐ in Ps. 73:8.

¹ See Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, sec. 137b, n. 1, and Grätz *ad loc.*

² The prepositions בִּי, לִי, מִי in Hebrew are often either omitted or placed where they are not absolutely needed. Sometimes they take the place of another letter. Hence the reading ܕܠܚܝܬܐ for ܕܠܚܝܬܐ; see Heller, *loc. cit.*, p. 56.

³ Cf., e.g., Deut. 32:24; Hab. 3:5; Ps. 76:4; 78:48; Job 5:7, etc.

⁴ Kennicott found this reading in 116 MSS and De Rossi in 114.

9. **וְשִׁירָה** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐ ,¹ though in other places this word is rendered by such expressions as ܡܠܟܐ , ܡܠܟܐ , etc.² **לְוַח אֲרוֹ** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} in the plural ܠܘܚܐܢܐ = **לְוַח אֲרוֹ**, but the reading of Bar Hebraeus, which is older and more correct, is in the singular, ܠܘܚܐ , and is supported by \mathfrak{S}^{au} .³

10. **וְשִׁירָה מִגְדָּלוֹת** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **וְשִׁירָה מִגְדָּלוֹת**, a reading supported by \mathfrak{E}^B and Vulgate. But for the omission of the letter **כ** see n. ad 8:6.

11. **וְפִרְיוֹ רַב בְּעַל הַמִּין** is freely translated in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **וְפִרְיוֹ רַב**. Similarly the Vulgate: *Vinea fuit pacifico in ea, quae habet populos*. Compare also Aquila, *ἐν ἔχοντι πλήθη*, and Symmachus, *ἐν κατοχῇ ὄχλου*.—For **נָתַן** \mathfrak{S} has ܢܬܢܐ as if it were **נָתַתִּי**, and for **יְבִיא** \mathfrak{S} gives ܢܬܢܐ = **נָתַתִּי**.

12. \mathfrak{S} correctly renders **לְנָטְרִים אֵת** by ܠܢܬܪܐܝܢܐ ; cf. above, ad 1:6.—**פִּרְיוֹ** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} without any possessive ending, ܠܚܢܐ .

13. **הַיּוֹשִׁבִּים** is translated in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ . So also Symmachus.—**הַבְּרִים** is omitted in \mathfrak{S} , while for **מִקְשִׁיבִים** \mathfrak{S} gives ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **וּמִקְשִׁיבִים**.—**לְקוֹלֶךְ** is in \mathfrak{S} rendered by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **לְקוֹלֶךְ**. Accordingly the verse should read **הַיּוֹשִׁבִּים בְּעֵינִים וּמִקְשִׁיבִים לְקוֹלֶךְ**. **הַשְּׂמִיעִי**.

14. **בְּרַח** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ ⁴ (as **כֹּב** in 2:17) instead of **חַפֵּי**.—For **וְדַמְיָה** \mathfrak{S} has ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **וְדַמְיָה**.—**אוֹ לַעֲפָר** is rendered in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ , but see 2:17.—**הָרִי בְּשָׁמַיִם** is translated in \mathfrak{S} by ܠܚܢܐܢܐ = **הָרִי בְּשָׁמַיִם**. So also Theodotion, *ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη θυμιαμάτων*. See also our note on 2:17.

CONCLUSION

In these notes on the Syriac text of the Song of Songs an endeavor was made to illustrate the departure of the Peshitta from the accepted vocalization, punctuation, and interpretation of single words in the Masoretic text. The exegetical method of the Peshitta as exemplified in phrases and sentences which sometimes receive a

¹ By a remarkable coincidence the editions $\mathfrak{S}^{\text{wlu}}$ share in misspelling this word ܠܚܢܐܢܐ ; cf. Göttsberger, *Bar Hebraeus*, etc., p. 104, n. 1, and see Rahlfs *ZATW*, Vol. 9 (1889), p. 163.

² See, e.g., the Syriac version of Num. 31:10 and Ps. 69:26.

³ Cf. Rahlfs, *ZATW*, IX (1889), 166.

⁴ Cod. Poc. reads ܠܚܢܐܢܐ , Uss. ܠܚܢܐܢܐ . See Thorndyke's collation, p. 30.

The Syriac version of the Song of Songs is a literal rendition of the Hebrew text; but while literal, it is not slavish, and its style is smooth and flowing. Indeed, it is well done and compares well with many modern versions in respect to reproducing the exact meaning of the original. In this respect the Peshitta of the Song of Songs almost supersedes all other ancient versions of this book.¹

When the translator here and there permits himself certain liberties, they are to be regarded either as products of the translator's insufficient knowledge of the richness of the Hebrew language (e.g., 1:3; 2:5; 4:1), or caused by the poverty in the vocabulary of the Syriac tongue and by its inability to reproduce the precise meaning of Hebrew poetic expressions,² and they may also be due to the possibility of the Peshitta having been made from a Hebrew text differing from that of the Masoretic (e.g., 1:4; 2:17; 7:3), for it actually presupposes a Hebrew original slightly differing from that now in our possession. In all cases where the Peshitta appears to have been made from a Hebrew text varying from the present Masoretic text it is important to examine carefully whether the ancient Hebrew text from which it was made, and which must have been much older

¹ To prove this assertion the following three examples will suffice: (a) 1:3: לריח שמיניך טובים שמיניך טובים; LXX, καὶ ὁσμὴ μύρρον σου ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα = ריחא דשמינך טבא וריחא דשמינך טבא. (b) 2:7: בצבאות או באילות; LXX, ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν λαχούσιν. It evidently took אילות and צבאות not as plurals of עצי or אייל respectively, but rather as of עץא and אייל. The Vulg. which is so largely dependent upon the LXX here deviates from it. (c) 1:4: After נרוצה both the Hebrew and the Peshitta have הביאני, etc., while the LXX inserts it after εἰς ὅσον κέρως σου = לריח שמיניך; cf. also Vulg., post te curremus in odorem unguentorum tuorum. There are also cases where the LXX presents a better reading than the Peshitta; cf., e.g., 2:1, Hebrew ואני, LXX Ἐγώ (likewise Vulg. Ego), but מן=מן.

² See, e.g., 1:6; 2:1; 4:8. R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*, p. 16: "On ne s'attendra pas à trouver dans leur productions poétiques les hautes envolées du lyrisme ni le charme naïf et captivant de l'épopée héroïque."

than the earliest MSS we possess, was or was not more correct in those passages than the *textus receptus*.

It is an indisputable fact that in the printed text of the Peshitta words and even verses are not infrequently wanting. This has probably arisen from the worn and defective state of the MSS from which the text has been printed and the very few MSS which have been collated. That in many cases they arose chiefly from defects in the copies of the Syriac version which have been consulted, appears from the fact that in almost every instance, so far as our examination has extended, the omitted passage is preserved in one or all of the primary versions of the Bible. On the other hand, there are a number of passages concerning which we have no reason to suppose that the Hebrew original from which the Peshitta was made differed from our present Masoretic text. The translator has expressed, in language nearly, though not literally, corresponding to the Hebrew, the sense of the original. For it must be remembered that the Hebrew language is proverbially concise, and consequently not infrequently obscure. The Syriac translator, familiar with the Hebrew, sometimes conveys its sense more clearly and fully.

True, while the Peshitta seems to have been made from a text differing slightly from the received Hebrew text, it must not be overlooked that these differences mostly relate to matters of very little, if of any, consequence, sometimes making a passage clearer; and there are also places where the Peshitta presents a better reading than does the Masoretic text or explains a difficult word in the Hebrew text (e.g., 1:2; 2:17; 6:9). There are cases where the Syriac does not differ so much from the Masoretic text as a casual reference to that version might lead one to suppose. In some cases the difference is merely in the position of the pauses (cf. 7:6), or of vowel points (cf. 2:4), the Syriac words according with the Hebrew. However, in some cases a transposition of words is evident (cf. 2:5, 13). All this points to the fact that the Hebrew text used as basis for the Peshitta was entirely unvocalized.

Great liberties are taken in the Peshitta with the prefix ׀. In some places where the Hebrew text does not have it the Peshitta presents it, and vice versa (e.g., 7:13; 8:14). Nor are Hebrew infinitives carefully treated in the Peshitta (cf. 6:11). while the

interrogative **לֹא תִגִּידוּ לָהּ** in 5:8 is converted in the Peshitta into an imperative. Not infrequently does the Syriac Bible present a reading different from the Hebrew original, caused by a difference in the reading of vowels or the elimination of words found in the Hebrew text (e.g., 1:16) or the addition of words not represented in the Hebrew original (e.g., 4:16), which, of course, should not be attributed to the carelessness of the translator, but rather to the fact that his text may have differed from that now in our possession.

Most remarkable is the manner of the translator in rendering proper names. The Peshitta does not hesitate to translate such a name as **שֶׁרֶן** by the plural **ܫܪܝܢܐ**. Only such popular names as Jerusalem and Lebanon are correctly preserved in **ܫ**. There can be no question therefore that in this manner the Peshitta was influenced by LXX (e.g., 4:3,11). Very likely with the author of the Peshitta it was merely a matter of accuracy to translate whatever could be translated, which is not the case with the Targum. In the latter the allegorical motive, in a most exaggerated form, is exhibited particularly in the rendering of proper names.¹

Again, in some places the Peshitta has unnecessary repetition of expressions (e.g., 5:1) which is undoubtedly due to the carelessness of the copyist rather than to the fault of the translator. An examination of MSS evidence shows this to be the case (see note on 5:1). On the other hand, the Peshitta omits one word in a sentence where the preceding passage closes with the plural of that word. Perhaps the translator regarded it as an unnecessary repetition, as in 4:14.

It was already pointed out that the author of the Peshitta allows himself certain liberties in the manner of his translation. Occasionally the translator endeavors to amend the text, while at other times he will render it very freely (e.g., 1:6), though as a whole the Peshitta is faithful to the Hebrew and in some places renders the original slavishly (e.g., 1:13). Very frequently the Syriac differs entirely from the Hebrew original. This may chiefly be noticed in passages of acknowledged difficulty. Thus it is quite remarkable to find a difficult Hebrew word rendered by a likewise difficult and

¹ Thus, e.g., **כְּתִרְצָה** is rendered in the Targum by **בְּזִמְן דְּצִבְוִתָּהּ לְמַעַבְרָה רְעוּתִי**; **הַשׁוֹלֵמִית** the Targum has **כְּנִשְׁתָּא דִּישְׂרָאֵל**; **בַּחֲשֹׁבֹן** is rendered in the Targum by **וִידְעִין לְמַמְנִי חֻשְׁבְּנִי עֲבוּרִין וּמַעַבְרִין וְקִבְעִין רִישֵׁי יִרְחִין וְרִישֵׁי שְׁנִין**.

unintelligible Syriac expression (e.g., 1:4). Again, in other places a false root determination is noticeable (e.g., 1:7).

Finally we must not overlook such deviations from the Hebrew text as the emendation of an absolute state with 𐤒𐤓 to the construct state (e.g., 1, 6); the use of a proper name in the singular where the Hebrew has a plural (e.g., 1:14), and vice versa (e.g., 2:2), and the real singular for such with a pronominal suffix of the first person (e.g., 5:2); the application of an actual plural suffix of the first person in the plural (e.g., 5:1). Likewise, the pronominal suffix of the second person for the third (e.g., 1:4); the pronominal suffix of the first person plural for the first person singular (e.g., 8:2), and the attachments of pronominal suffixes where they are absent from the Hebrew text (e.g., 8:5); the application of the first person plural for that of the third person (e.g., 1:3); the plural imperative for the singular (e.g., 1:7), and the conversion of a relative passage to that of a copulative one (e.g., 4:15); the attachment of the relative prefix where it is absent from the Masoretic text (e.g., 7:3), indicating the relative upon another name (e.g., 6:5); the dividing of one word into two parts,¹ etc.

Despite all these differences between the Masoretic text and that of the Peshitta, there can be no doubt that the Peshitta text of the Song of Songs was made from a Hebrew original differing but slightly from that now in our possession. Further evidence of this theory is found in the fact that some Hebrew words are preserved in the Syriac version. Thus, e.g., the Hebrew 𐤒𐤓𐤕, which the Greek renders by ἀδελφιδός μου, is translated in the Syriac text *dôd(j)* although it conveys a different meaning from that of the Hebrew word.

Though there is no room to doubt that the Peshitta was made directly from the Hebrew, yet there are many passages in which it exhibits a departure from our Hebrew text and agrees with the LXX (e.g., 1:6; 4:1-2). There are two theories about this; either the Syriac translator availed himself of the assistance of the LXX where he did not comprehend the Hebrew, or, which is more likely, that it is due to later ages having corrupted the Peshitta by consciously adopting some of the translations of the LXX.² In the case of the Song of

¹ See, e.g., 7:7 and cf. our note *ad loc.*

² See our discussion of the "Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta," in *AJSL*, XXXVI (January, 1920), pp. 161-66.

Songs the agreements of the Peshitta with LXX against the Masoretic text may be due to the fact that the Hebrew MSS used for LXX were of the same nature as those used for the Peshitta, having been entirely unvocalized and written *in continuo*. The differences in the texts are to be found in comparatively few places and these are mostly due to false word divisions or incorrect vowel readings. Hence no influence of LXX can be pointed to. Of the few (about twelve) places where the Peshitta agrees with LXX against the Masoretic text five only can, more or less, be considered as possible, but no absolute conviction can be derived from them.

As a whole the Peshitta, as a version, is quite good. In its word arrangements it agrees, with but a few exceptions, with the Masoretic text. While the translation is not a servile one, it is nevertheless true to the original. Additions are very few, and in most cases they are borrowed from parallel places. The omissions are hardly worth while mentioning. Only one passage is paraphrased (7:11) while the Peshitta suffers in several places from corruption.

What, then, is its value for the textual criticism of the Song of Songs? Since the Peshitta is a servile version, the translator, allowing himself certain occasional liberties, particularly in difficult places, while in other places corrupted readings are transmitted, it must be used with great care in the criticism of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Only in cases where the Peshitta reading is difficult, or cannot be explained other than as a diversion from the Masoretic text, or when its reading is attested by other evidence (LXX, Aq., Sym., Theod., Vulg., and MSS) can it be utilized profitably for the criticism of the Masoretic text. The Peshitta is in most cases rather a favorable witness for the Masoretic text than its critic. Cornill's conclusion regarding the Syriac text of Ezekiel¹ is equally applicable to that of the Song of Songs:

Aus allem dem geht hervor, dass § als Zeuge für die alttestamentliche Textkritik nur mit der grössten Vorsicht zu benützen ist. Doch thut das ihrem hohen Werthe keinen Eintrag; für die exegetische Tradition ist sie ein Hauptzeuge, und dabei bietet sie uns doch eine Anzahl von wirklich guten Lesarten.